

REMARKS

Claims 1-38 are pending with claims 1, 12, 17, and 21-26 being independent. Claims 1, 12, 17, and 21-26 have been amended, and claims 27-38 have been added. Reconsideration and allowance of this application are requested in view of the amendments and the following remarks.

Independent claims 1, 12, 17 and 21- 26, along with their dependent claims 3, 6- 11, 13-16 and 18-20, have been rejected under §102(e) as being anticipated by Tsimelzon (U.S. Patent No. 6,834, 306). Claims 1, 12, 17, and 21-26 have been amended to obviate this rejection.

Claims 1, 12, and 17, as amended, each recite “instructing the remote server to generate an alert feed *in response to the remote server detecting the state change*” (emphasis added). Applicants request reconsideration and withdrawal of the rejection of claims 1, 12, and 17, and their dependent claims 3, 6-11, 13-16 and 18-20, because Tsimelzon does not describe or suggest instructing a remote server to generate an alert feed in response to the remote server detecting a change in state at the remote server.

Tsimelzon describes a system that enables a user to specify certain web pages (and portions thereof) of interest, monitors the user-specified web pages (and portions thereof) by periodically accessing the web pages in accordance with a user specified notification frequency, and notifies the user if the contents of the web pages (and portions thereof) have changed in accordance with user-specified criteria. Specifically, a user designates a portion or block of a web page to be tracked, a notification frequency for that block (e.g., check for a change in the block contents every hour), and a notification condition (e.g., block B < \$30). A server 120 retrieves a web page from a web page server 132, 134, 136 at regular intervals of time in accordance with the notification frequency (e.g., each hour), finds the block of the web page designated by the user for tracking, and checks whether the notification condition set by the user has been met (e.g., is block B < \$30?). If the notification condition has been met (e.g., block B is less than \$30), the server 120 sends a notification to the user. See Fig. 18(b); col. 11, line 64 to

col. 12, line 67. If the notification condition has not been met, the server 120 does not send a notification to the user.

The Office Action equates web page server 132, 134, 136 to the claimed remote server. However, as is evident from Tsimelzon, web page server 132, 134, 136 does not detect a state change. Rather, web page server 132, 134, 136 merely and consistently replies to periodic requests from server 120 with web page information, without checking for or otherwise conditioning its response on state changes. Accordingly, the web page server 132, 134, 136, which the Examiner equates to the recited remote server, is not instructed to generate an alert feed in response to detection of a state change at the web page server 132, 134, 136.

Notably, the instructing element also is not met if server 120 of Tsimelzon is considered as the remote server, because server 120 is not instructed to generate an alert feed in response to detection of a state change at server 120.

For at least these reasons, applicants request reconsideration and withdrawal of the rejection of claims 1, 12, and 17, and their dependent claims 3, 6-11, 13-16 and 18-20.

Claims 21, 22, 24, and 25, as amended, each recite “instructing the remote server to broadcast alert feeds *in response to changes of state at the remote server*” (emphasis added), and claims 23 and 26, as amended, each recite a host configured to “cause the remote server to broadcast alert feeds *in response to changes of state at the remote server*” (emphasis added). For at least the reasons described above for claims 1, 12, and 17, applicants request reconsideration and withdrawal of the rejection of claims 21-26 because Tsimelzon does not describe or suggest causing or instructing a remote server to broadcast alert feeds in response to changes of state at the remote server.

Claims 2, 4, and 5 have been rejected as being unpatentable over Tsimelzon in view of Atsmon (U.S. Patent No. 6,607,136). Claims 2, 4, and 5 depend from claim 1. Atsmon does not remedy the failure of Tsimelzon to describe or suggest instructing a remote server to generate an alert feed in response to the remote server detecting a change

Applicant : Mark Donner et al.
Serial No. : 09/624,191
Filed : July 24, 2000
Page : 14 of 14

Attorney's Docket No.: 06975-100001 /
Communications 23

in state. Accordingly, applicants request reconsideration and withdrawal of the rejection of claims 2, 4, and 5.

Applicants submit that all claims are in condition for allowance.

Enclosed is a check in the amount of \$1510, of which \$790 is for the filing of the RCE, \$600 is for excess claim fees, and \$120 is for the Petition for Extension of Time fee. Please apply any other charges or credits to deposit account 06-1050.

Respectfully submitted,



Roberto J. Devoto
Reg. No. 55,108

Date: June 22, 2005

Customer No.: 26171
Fish & Richardson P.C.
1425 K Street, N.W.
11th Floor
Washington, DC 20005-3500
Telephone: (202) 783-5070
Facsimile: (202) 783-2331

40286918.doc